

APR - 8 1949

DETROIT

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. IX, No. 5

APRIL 4, 1949

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

World Church and World Order

Limitations and Possibilities

THE recent National Study Conference on the Churches and World Order again suggests questions which are often in the minds of thoughtful citizens both within and outside the churches: What is the role of Christians in the struggle for world order? Just how important is the influence of the churches upon the policies of governments and the decisions of statesmen, through which world order must be achieved?

An overall answer might be: considerably less important than many churchfolk, especially ministers, suppose; somewhat more important than most secularists, including statesmen, recognize. The overestimates of church leaders result from unwillingness to face and rightly appraise the limitations upon Christian effectiveness in the political order. The underestimates of politicians follow from failure to sense and adequately judge the profounder and more intangible factors in the making and unmaking of world order, as well as the actual demonstrated influence of churchmen at crucial points.

The inherent limitations upon the churches' role in contemporary world affairs, to which their more ardent adherents are consistently blind, are of two kinds: those implicit in the realities of the present international situation, and those arising from illusions as to the manner and extent of influence which Christians do, or indeed should, exert.

Blindness to limitations of the first type is especially prevalent among rank-and-file church people. It is illustrated by their bland insistence that statesmen should determine international questions "in accordance with Christian principles and ideals," when somewhat less than a third of the peoples of the world for whom these statesmen speak confess any Christian allegiance whatever. Or, in the plea that the procedures of the United Nations should be opened with prayer and conducted under a common acknowledgment of God, when one large group of the member nations are committed in principle to militant atheism. Indeed, this points to one of the most crippling limitations upon the influence of a World Church upon world order. Ideally that influ-

ence would be exerted by Christians of *different* nations speaking and acting concertedly in relation to their respective governments. But in the one overarching division which harasses comity and imperils peace, churchmen on the two sides of the chasm are wholly out of speaking range of each other, and those on one side accept no responsibility to declare a Christian witness to their governments, but rather acknowledge, in political affairs, the authority of their governments as regnant over any obligations to a Christian world community. These are commonplaces to those actually embroiled in international negotiation, but they are all too frequently disregarded by those who proclaim that World Christianity can produce One World.

No less serious are the limitations springing from illusions under which many churchmen suffer as to the effectiveness of the measures which they employ within the sphere where they can exert significant influence. Foremost here is the most cherished delusion of American Christians in recent times—that to declare the truth is to assure that somehow the truth declared will automatically be accepted and implemented. Upon this delusion rests their childlike confidence in the efficacy of church pronouncements. Hard experience has measurably tempered that confidence. But it persists. It is important that the truth be proclaimed, and that is one of the essential and indisputable functions of the churches. But to discover and formulate the Christian mind on any great issue of public concern is to take only the first step toward its adoption in action, and a step which alone leads to ineffectiveness and despite in the public eye and to pathetic self-deception and disillusionment for Christians themselves. In the future, relatively larger attention must be given, not to the formulation and promulgation of impressive declarations, but to intensive study of how political decisions are actually taken, and then to the far more difficult and unpleasant task of securing acceptance and implementation by those who determine political action. This raises the most vital questions of relations of church and state, of Christian action in society, on which

there is only confused and, at present, divided opinion among American churchmen.

What, then, is the role of the World Church with respect to world order, and what is the measure of its importance? Its influence appears at at least four points:

1. Through individual Christians in positions of responsible leadership among the nations and in the United Nations. To those familiar with the work of both the American and the world Commissions of the Churches on International Affairs, it is well-known that perhaps their most effective service has been to lend personal support and encouragement, and then to mobilize public support behind the efforts of Mr. John Foster Dulles and his colleagues upon whom has so largely rested the responsibility to get Christian judgment translated into governmental decisions. Perhaps the most impressive concrete accomplishment for which direct action by the churches can claim determinative influence is United Nations' policy respecting colonial territories. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the fact that, in the implementation of that policy through the Trusteeship Council, leadership has been so largely in the hands of a group of convinced Christian laymen from many nations—Mr. Dulles and Mr. Francis Sayre of the United States, Dr. Malek of Lebanon, Dr. P. C. Chang of China, Sir Maharaj Singh of India and others. Here, we see the World Church functioning effectively through its trusted spokesmen in the furtherance of Christian concern for hundreds of millions of subject peoples, most of them non-Christians.

2. Through direct action in support of measures clearly dictated by Christian principles. It is generally recognized that the transformation of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for virtually a league of Great Powers into the San Francisco Charter of the United Nations as a democratic association of countries large and small, with far-visioned provisions for backward peoples, was the result of insistent pressure by American churches supported by Christian opinion and agitation in other lands. The influence of the churches' representatives upon the drafting of the Charter of Human Rights is another concrete proof that the churches can count, and count decisively, on specific issues, when they have a clear moral right to declare the Christian conscience, when they speak unitedly, and when they are willing to invest the time and effort required to effect results in any complex and controverted question.

3. Through a Christian analysis of international issues and the formulation and advocacy of Christian resolutions of these issues. This is the aspect of the churches' role on the world scene to which,

for too long, almost exclusive attention was given, and which most Christians still assume to be the major, if not the only, channel of Christian influence. We have already noted the limited effectiveness of church pronouncements in themselves. But this remains one of the churches' indispensable tasks.

4. Through the development and strengthening of a Christian World Community, as vivid demonstration of the possibility of global understanding and cooperation transcending historic barriers of race, language, tradition and outlook, and thus as promise and foretaste of political world community which *must be* if mankind is to escape the fate which threatens more ominously with each passing year. This is the particular function of the World Church strictly defined. But it requires that what is now hardly more than an association in fellowship shall carefully yet boldly evolve into a "world community" with appropriate organs and practices, so that the very term now so widely used, "World Church," shall grow beyond an aspiration into an operative reality. Herein lies the crucial significance of the immediate future of the World Council of Churches and the cognate structures of Ecumenical Christianity.

H. P. V. D.

Church World Service in 1948

During 1948, the American Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Churches achieved, for the third consecutive year, an outstanding record in the field of overseas relief and reconstruction, sending through Church World Service more than \$16,000,000 in funds and relief supplies to aid in rebuilding the physical and spiritual structure in many impoverished lands.

The total figure for 1948 surpassed that of 1947 by more than one million dollars. Altogether, since Church World Service was formed in 1946, about \$40,000,000 in funds and supplies have been channelled overseas through it.

The aid, consisting of food, clothing, medicines, religious literature, prefabricated churches and other goods, as well as funds to aid church institutions, pastors, students and refugees, went to more than 40 countries in Europe, Asia and Africa. Besides this, 1,250 Displaced Persons were assisted during 1948 by Church World Service in coming to the United States for resettlement, and about 40 theological students were aided in coming to America for seminary study.

—E.P.S. Geneva

Authors in This Issue

A. Roy Eckardt is on the faculty of Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin.

John Foster Dulles hardly requires an introduction. His leadership in international relations of the Federal Council of Churches and as delegate of the United States on the General Assembly of the United Nations is well known to everyone.

The End of a World and the Beginning of a New One*

A. ROY ECKARDT

THE present millennium in the West has seen the rise and fall of two cultures, the Medieval and the Modern. The former gave way to the latter and the latter is giving away to—what? It is of course foolish to try to predict in blue-print fashion what is going to happen to the Western world. No one knows what is going to happen. "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail." (I Corinthians 13:8.) But as St. Paul goes on to say, we do at least know in part, and hence we may prophesy in part.

While it is true that we moderns have failed to stress sufficiently the "fate" side of human existence, or, to use a more Christian term, the providential element, I believe we must not lose sight of man's character as a free person. There are many who are convinced that much of our present plight stems from the habit of imagining ourselves masters of our destiny. This judgment is in harmony with the Christian gospel. And yet man possesses freedom—even if only in the sense of being able to inhibit for a time the action of divine grace. Ultimately, it is God and not man that rules history, but man through his free spirit does exercise causal force in the development of the historical process. To say that everything is laid out for us in determinist fashion is to call into question that freedom which is the *sine qua non* for spiritual and moral action. Arnold Toynbee is right in affirming that man has considerable power to tip the historical scales in this, rather than that, direction.

The great accent upon sin in recent theology was and is completely justified. We must be careful, however, to avoid employing the fact of sin as a rationalization for spiritual lethargy and moral laziness. An expression of agreement with Toynbee's view need not arise from the presuppositions of humanism or rationalism. Christian faith interprets man as a person. More than this it believes that all other philosophies tend to depersonalize man. "The sovereignty of God must find expression in a way which corresponds to the nature of God—in love, by love, for love. . . . God can only have communion with a free being."** The paradox of Christianity is that God is sovereign and yet that man possesses freedom.

The point of this introductory word is that analyses of what we believe is now occurring in human history and of what is to be attempted for the fu-

ture may actually exert an influence upon that future. Such interpretations are not merely academic. Thought is an aspect of freedom and "ideas have consequences." A distinguishing feature of man among the animals is his ability to *know* what is happening to him and hence to do something about his situation. If man's historical life represents a combination of fate and freedom, he may by reason of both these elements "prophesy in part" about the future. On the one hand, in the providence of God history seems to be moving in certain at least partially definable directions, and, on the other hand, human freedom may help to bring about correlative events—or for that matter work to prevent their occurrence. Prediction is of course closely related to hope.***

I

The freedom of the human spirit forced medieval culture to die. On the socio-economic side the Industrial Revolution served as a convenient vehicle for the expression of that freedom, while the Reformation, the Renaissance and the Enlightenment performed similar functions in the spiritual and cultural order. The Reformation, however, tried to preserve the God-centered element of the Middle Ages and was partially successful. But secular humanism and individualism, in throwing man back upon himself, led to the collapse of freedom in Fascism and Marxism. Industrialization meant the slavery of man to the machine, although only because human society had already disintegrated spiritually. Science has now produced instrumentalities which can bring about the death of mankind unless they are socially controlled.

The apostle of enlightenment may protest that current Christian presentations of the plight of twentieth century man represent inaccurate and biased historical generalizations. It is certainly true that, at best, analyses of the fate of whole civilizations are hazardous undertakings and it may well be that

*** A striking and paradoxical thing about the public opinion poll is that it may preclude the exact results which it predicts, since when a person sees how things are apparently going he may vote or behave differently from the way he originally intended. This helps to show the absurdity of trying to understand human behavior solely by the methods employed in the "tests and measurements" of animals. It is the case that such polls often attain a remarkable degree of accurate prediction, but this does not alter the fact that a particular individual may be influenced by them to use his freedom in a new direction. Such indeed may have actually been the case in the victory of Harry S. Truman over Thomas E. Dewey in November 1948.

* Based on a chapel address at Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin, January 6, 1949.

** Emil Brunner, *Justice and the Social Order*, p. 55.

Christian theology must here remain confessional lest it claim too much for itself: "This is the way I as a Christian interpret the historical situation. I can do no other." The naturalist critic may contend, for example, that our present troubles are due to *insufficient* emancipation from orthodox tradition. And when the question arises of deliverance through science and rational endeavor, the claim is made that what we really need is more of the same.

This article represents more of a confessional than an apologetic interest but we may at least reply to the criticism indicated with an example to illustrate that the Christian interpretation of man and his plight is not founded on unprovable a priori premises but is actually experiential at base. It may be granted that post-First World War Germany was not exactly an educational paradise. But one should have expected that the *degree* of ethical and cultural achievement in Germany would at least have insured the exertion of enough German wisdom to prevent the extreme fury of Nazism. When one reflects upon the fact that a considerable section of a whole civilized nation could within a short span of years revert to primitive tribalism, he must needs wonder about the efficacy of "enlightenment." The tragedy of the human spirit reflected in National Socialism is seen in the fact that man can employ the highest achievements of technology and reason for demonic purposes. Man's problem is not primarily one of increasing his knowledge but one of conversion from a worship of the creature to a worship of the only One who is deserving of sacrificial devotion.

In any case, speaking from the point of view of a Christian personalism, I should like to offer a word of strong support of the view which insists that the new world, which we at least hope will emerge from the crisis of our time, must reflect neither an authoritarian social structure nor one of absolute liberty—that is, not if Western man has learned the lesson presented by the demise of two civilizations. Insofar as the church attempts to reassert authoritarianism it fails to read history. And where voices are raised to proclaim a needed resurgence of the *laissez faire* spirit, these same voices do not realize that "the hour of His judgment is come." A world in which the power of atomic energy has been actualized by man is an interdependent world and the individual who asserts his right to complete autonomy runs the gauntlet of annihilation for his fellows and incidentally for himself. Where the particular man is not seen as standing under the judgment of God as represented, at least partially, in communal welfare, there lies the danger of the exploitation of other men. Many Christians are coming to feel that a certain amount of public guidance of social and economic activity is necessary, lest the individual successfully assert his will-to-power over other persons. Similarly, where the state or community is

looked upon as exempt from a divine judgment beyond itself, we witness the destruction of the individual and his God-given rights. Only through a realization of the sovereignty of God over both the individual and society do we avoid both the Scylla of anarchy and the Charybdis of totalitarianism.

II

If these general reflections are possible, a more specific observation is that the new world will be conditioned by the present and future clash between the Soviet Union and the West. Once again the dangers of mechanical prediction must be emphasized. One is tempted these days to affirm that a global war, with Russia and the United States as the chief foes, appears inevitable. While this contention appears unwarranted, since in history "anything can happen," it does seem justified to maintain on the basis of what has happened to date that the direction of history in the next fifty years will be considerably determined by the Russo-American conflict, however, that conflict be resolved. A war-minded prophetism may contend that the outbreak of war is a matter of months—this on the basis of inexorable historical forces already in operation. To use a biblical analogy, while Assyria has recently been destroyed, Babylon is appearing on the horizon. Babylon may not be quite as ruthless as Assyria but its campaign for world conquest is just as manifest. The Nazi role has been assumed by the Soviet. One need not fancy himself a second Jeremiah to see the judgment coming. Amidst its material splendor, spiritual pride and overt atheism, the United States is on its way to destruction. How could there be an alternative? Russia will doubtless be destroyed also, just as was Babylon. The United States may serve as a weapon of God's anger too, although the analogy is incomplete, since Judah was practically helpless militarily. The specific outcome will probably be somewhat different from that suffered by the sixth century Hebrew nation. And yet, the judgment of God upon a morally and spiritually decadent America must be carried out. The United States may win the war but it will suffer with the vanquished the common tragedy which modern war (the term is outmoded) brings to the victor as well as to his defeated foe.

Such war-minded prophetism has much to recommend it. We may, however, differ over the measure of divine judgment to which America is subject. In addition, God may well proceed in terms of a *silent judgment*, operating quite independently of the clamor of battle. The prophets were not always historically accurate. God moves in mysterious ways his judgments to perform. The intention here is not to deny the inexorability of God's judgments but simply to point to the need for caution in our interpretation of divine action.

What the outcome will be of the clash described above is anybody's guess. Should the conflict reach a military stage, one possibility is of course the disappearance of mankind from the face of the earth, although even atomic or germ warfare need not require this result. In the event, however, that man is destroyed Christian faith will not be impugned but simply demonstrated. For in our interdependent world men will either live in accordance with the requirements of divine justice or they will run the danger of being annihilated through their own folly.

III

One mode of interpreting the contemporary international scene is to hold that the Soviet Union and the United States both stand for a half truth. In Hegelian terms America is the thesis, representing freedom and the rights of man, while Russia is the antithesis, embodying—just as did the Nazis in a similarly distorted manner—man's perennial desire for order, community and security. If from a theological-prophetic point of view the Soviet has been raised up as a judgment upon an exploitive form of individualism, best exemplified in modern *laissez faire* capitalism, we may also affirm that the function of America is one of a judgment upon that ruthless totalitarianism which destroys human dignity and liberty. If God is actually bringing about a synthesis between freedom and order, individualism and collectivism, personal initiative and communal welfare—and the writer sincerely hopes that such an analysis is not blasphemous—it then becomes the vocation of the Christian humbly to pledge himself to the furtherance of the end indicated. There are some who will deny that this synthesis is to be looked upon as our primary, or even desirable, goal. Yet all Christians will agree that we must set ourselves with all our power to the God-given task of shaping the new world, spiritually, intellectually and morally, in accordance with the insights of the Christian gospel. If my interpretation of the gospel is incorrect, other interpretations may be proclaimed to take its place. The gospel remains our criterion of truth.

Should this particular analysis make some kind of sense then the casualties of the general and specific developments outlined have been and will be justifiably numerous. They include Christian authoritarianism, atomistic "rational" individualism, and totalitarian destructiveness. The bourgeois and proletarian classes have shown themselves to be twin embodiments of false messianic power. And that more impersonal messiah, science, has been revealed as a pseudo-saviour.

What goals are we to substitute for such false philosophies and false gods? It is here that we can live only by faith and not by sight, trusting that the

future will see the implementing of our hopes: The Christian church may survive to proclaim its eternal gospel of Christ. Ideally, Christian faith has the power to preserve a workable tension between freedom and order; it seems to me that the ultimate cleansing judgment man needs is found only in Christ. The church must make it known that man, both individually and collectively, is subject to God through Christ and yet that this fact is precisely the proper foundation for true freedom. Exactly what form the Christianity of the future may take is an open question. I believe though that the church will play a definite and important role. The reason for saying this is that already the church has begun to recover from its long decline. A new Reformation seems in the offing. Witness, among other things, the Ecumenical Movement and the renaissance of theology. Secondly, we may hope that a chastened science, shorn of messianic pretensions, will play a part in the new world. Science and the scientific method seem here to stay. Christian liberalism made an enduring contribution when it divined in the scientific protest against mediavalism the realization that truth is one. The God of Christianity is the God of the laboratory. More than this, man must be free to seek the truth. Finally, as a secular counterpart to the spiritual order, some kind of planned society may serve as a middle way between exploitive individualism and ruthless totalitarianism.

Such an outline may simply be a combination of prejudice and speculation. If these reflections serve to stimulate other and different hopes they will have accomplished something. For it is important that we strive earnestly, and each in his own way, for a comprehension of where mankind stands in history, so that we may humbly and in the presence of God set our course for the future. The reaction to mediavalism was successful but it overstepped its bounds. Can we not seek to achieve a new synthesis? As we live through the demise of a whole civilization it is our high calling as Christians—granted sincere differences in political and theological beliefs—to proclaim that our future destiny belongs to the God who works in history as judge and redeemer but in addition that each of us may play his part in bringing a new world to birth, whether in time or in eternity.

Abandon Hope of Retrial For Bishop Ordass

Hope of a retrial for Bishop Lajos Ordass, imprisoned head of the Lutheran Church in Hungary, appears to have been definitely abandoned in church circles in Budapest.

His lawyer indicated that Bishop Ordass felt it was better to withdraw his application for a retrial than to have it rejected by the civil authorities, as seems likely.

—Religious News Service

Is the United Nations Inadequate?

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

I AM often asked by people who want to do something for world peace whether I think they should put their efforts into support of the United Nations or into trying to transform the United Nations into some form of "world government" or "world federation." Of course the United Nations was designed to grow and it should never be supported as a static thing, but I think that efforts now to replace it or to transform it radically are, at best, futile and, at worst, dangerous.

No one, I suppose, is wholly satisfied with the United Nations Charter. Four years ago, immediately after the San Francisco Conference, I pointed out its inadequacy, and I went on to say:

"Anyone who is free to disregard realities and to act only in the realm of theory can write a 'better' Charter. A reasonably intelligent schoolboy could do that. The task of statesmanship, however, is to relate theory to reality. Political institutions ought to come as close to theoretical perfection as is consonant with their vigorous survival in the existing environment. Orchids may be the perfect flower. But it is a waste of time to plant orchids in Iceland. That is what many peace planners would do."

What is the existing world environment in which any world organization would have to live? To mention only one of many disturbing factors, those who govern about one-third of the human race believe that "government" is, in the words of Stalin, "a machine in the hands of the ruling class for suppressing the resistance of its class enemies"; that laws are not designed to reflect abstract "justice" and "right" but to be the weapons of the ruling class in its class struggle; and that the nature of man is such that he achieves his maximum fulfillment in serving those who constitute the State. In a world where this is one-third of the environment, how could it be possible to establish a "world government of law"? Of course it is not possible.

Furthermore, the world environment does not make it possible to have a peaceful enforcement of world law. There is no illusion greater than that results can be achieved merely by setting up a body to pass laws and giving it a police force. In our own experience we know that the Fourteenth and Fifteenth "equal rights" Amendments to our Constitution have been largely disregarded throughout the South for 70 years, and the Eighteenth "Prohibition" Amendment was largely disregarded throughout the United States. Unless laws reflect the opinion of the community to which they apply, so that they are voluntarily accepted by the great majority, they

are either disregarded or become enforceable only by what in fact is war, whereby one part of the community attempts forcibly to impose its views on another part. A police force can deal only with marginal and slight resistance.

It is interesting to observe that the most oft-cited failures of the United Nations have not been due to lack of power, but to the fact that existing coercive powers were not used, wisely I think, because they would risk war. The Charter gives the Security Council power to take certain decisions and back them with sanctions that would be very effective against Arabs, Jews, Dutch, etc. whose states have no veto power. But where the United Nations has attempted to get results by the process of issuing orders, rather than persuasion, it has largely failed because there was not behind the orders a sufficient weight of public opinion and sufficient voluntary acceptance, and the use of sanctions would have risked war.

That, I think, shows that the world environment is such that, even if it were possible to set up now something called "world government" or "world federation" to enact so-called "world laws," that would probably precipitate world war. The world government would feel compelled to try to give world-wide application to decisions that were highly disputable because of the great differences of moral and political opinion throughout the world.

There are times when peace is served by a degree of separation, and now is one of those times.

But, it may be said, why not develop common government or federation wherever there is the suitable environment of similar ideas about government, law and man and as to right and wrong? I see no objection to that, and many advantages. But seeking that does not call for disparaging the United Nations or rewriting its Charter. That Charter, as it is, not only permits, but encourages, the Member states to develop unity if they can. Already, within the framework of the Charter, there is the American Pact of Rio, the Arab League, the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Soviet communist bloc, the Brussels Pact of Western European states and the proposed Atlantic Pact. None of these, to be sure, creates a common government or law-making body, and in that respect they, too, may be inadequate. But that inadequacy is easier to remedy, because it involves working in a limited and relatively harmonious environment.

Increasing unity on a less than universal basis does not, however, detract from the importance of the United Nations. The goal is *world* peace and that goal can never be assured without an organiza-

tion that is *universal* and the United Nations is the only organization that now is, or that now could be, universal. It corresponds to the needs of a society that, from the standpoint of organization, is still primitive. When savage tribesmen or frontiersmen start to think about creating a political association, they first meet together to talk around the campfire or in a meeting hall. Some contemptuously call that a mere "debating society." Others call it a "town meeting of the world." In any event, only out of such discussion can common viewpoints be developed, common objectives be found and a world environment gradually created that will make possible a world organization that is more effectual.

The United Nations is the indispensable forerunner of something better, and it would be folly to abandon it merely because, like every beginning, it is inadequate. The folly would be the greater because the United Nations is no obstacle to the creation of the maximum amount of federal union that is now practical.

After World War I many American idealists found the League of Nations to be inadequate and

unworthy of their support. They wanted to get quickly and easily to the end goal—the abolition of war. So they invented the slogan "outlaw war" and sought by international treaty to legislate that slogan into reality. The Kellogg-Briand Pact did that in words, but its words did not stop World War II by a single day.

I hope that Americans will this time heed that lesson of their past, and will not, because the possible is hard and drab, abandon the possible in an effort to achieve the glamorous impossible.

Such glorious things can be built with words that it is always tempting to work in that medium and there is danger that American energy and idealism may again be siphoned off into trying to legislate peace in terms of slogans. Marriage vows are very beautiful, but we know that they do not themselves make happy unions. Peace, also, will never come merely out of promises to love and to obey. There is need of compatibility of temperament and the task of the peacemaker is to create union where that compatibility exists, and to struggle to develop compatibility where, unhappily, it does not yet exist.

The World Church: News and Notes

Denies Hungary Plans National Catholic Church

Foreign reports that the Hungarian government is trying to set up a national Catholic Church in Hungary separated from the Vatican were denounced from Budapest as "malicious rumors" by Father Istvan Balogh.

The priest made the statement during a speech at a national congress sponsored by the Popular Front.

"Although these allegations are vile and stupid," he said, "they must be rejected most solemnly, because they are being believed even by prelates abroad."

Father Balogh is the leader of the Independent Democratic People's Party which recently joined the Popular Front, formed by a coalition of the Socialist and Communist parties. He frequently clashed with Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, imprisoned Primate of Hungary, over political matters.

—*Religious News Service*

Chinese Refugees Building Christian Socialist Village

A group of Chinese refugees are building a model Christian socialist village near Hangchow.

Moving spirit behind the project is H. C. Ma, secretary of the East China Christian Education Association. He believes that if the experiment works "it may be the Christian answer to Communism."

Ma started the village project after refugees from Shantung began pouring into Shanghai. He organized a relief committee to help the refugees and then decided to establish a model village to provide homes and a livelihood for them.

A gift of 600 bags of flour from the China branch of Church World Service provided funds to help get started. The refugees themselves, a selected group of 58 heads of families, were each required to contribute three to five silver dollars as an indication of their interest and faith in the project.

Then a plot of land was purchased at P'ing Yao, near Hangchow, and the men went there and are already building houses for their families. In about two months they will be ready for their wives and children, who are waiting in Shanghai. When completed, the village will be a community of 250.

There is already a primary school at P'ing Yao, established by farm families of the neighborhood, who are willing to share it with the newcomers, and also will allow the building to be used for a church.

The families who will make up the new community were carefully chosen from a refugee group of 4,000. There are thirty persons among them who already are Christians, and all the others have pledged themselves to receive Christian training. All have renounced personal ambitions and have agreed to share everything.

They plan to raise cattle, sheep and chickens on a cooperative basis. For the first half year, members will receive food, clothing, and shelter but no wages. After that, thirty per cent of the profits from their enterprises will be used for village welfare and improvement and the rest will be divided according to need. Boys over 12 must work during the day but can go to school at night.

The village is now being run by a committee, but as soon as the families come the villagers will elect their own officers. There will be meetings once or

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	LISTON POPE
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Sec'y</i>

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
CHARLES W. GILKEY	JOHN A. MACKAY
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
UMPHREY LEE	FRANCIS P. MILLER
	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS	

twice a week to discuss village affairs and anyone can bring complaints or ideas for the betterment of the village to these meetings.

"This is Christian Socialism," says Mr. Ma.—Natalie Hankemeyer, *Religious News Service Correspondent*

Archbishop of Canterbury Repudiates Dean's Views

An attack on the political views of the Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, was made from London by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Geoffrey Francis Fisher.

The archbishop said in a statement that Dr. Johnson's public utterances on current affairs are "insensitive to the true facts of the situation." Dr. Johnson has often been called the "Red Dean" because of his pro-Communist statements.

Dr. Fisher recalled that in December, 1947, "I found it necessary to issue a statement dissociating myself from the political opinions and activities of the Dean of Canterbury.

"Nonetheless," he said, "it has recently been sup-

posed by many people in Canada and the United States during the Dean's visit to those countries that he speaks for the Archbishop of Canterbury or with his approval. I therefore repeat that this supposition is entirely incorrect.

"In his public utterances upon current affairs the Dean speaks, and, indeed, claims to speak only for himself and not at all for me or for the Chapter of Canterbury Cathedral or for the Church of England."

Answering the question, which he said had been frequently asked, as to why the Dean has not been removed from office, Dr. Fisher stated:

"First, for removal from office the law requires a trial and conviction in some civil or ecclesiastical court, and the Dean has not rendered himself liable to such a charge in either court.

"Secondly, in this country we greatly value the right to freedom of speech, and the law is slow to curtail it even when it proves inconvenient, irksome or hurtful. Its suppression is one of the grave charges against those totalitarian and police states which enjoy the Dean's confidence."—*Religious News Service*

Views From the Eastern Zone

"Men in the Eastern Zone who belong to the Evangelical Church betray in their faces and their bearing what a crisis is upon them, involving the ultimate problems of Christian existence."

This comment by an observer in the report published on work among men organized by an Evangelical Land Church in the Soviet-occupied Zone of Germany is followed by this reasoned exposition of the situation:

"The separation of Church and State, the removal of religious instruction from school time-tables and so on do not constitute either persecution or martyrdom of Christians. Technically everything is as it should be. The Word of God may be preached with complete freedom to all those who wish to hear it. Sermons may be delivered, sacraments administered and the spiritual ministry exercised. Open attacks on the church are confined to occasional outbursts by petty officials with a grievance, and have no particular significance. The expression of any openly anti-Christian or anti-ecclesiastical bias is discouraged. Official quarters still assert their unlimited tolerance." And yet he speaks of a crisis. Why?

"In no Land which is now within the sphere of State totalitarianism in its most accentuated form are there any longer any Christian illusions. The crisis does not consist in the calling in question of all the outwardly secure things in life, but in the way in which State and society are setting themselves up in conscious disregard of the requirement that they should be the order of God on earth. At the focal point stands man, knowing himself to be the ultimate and supreme value. But above all the crisis consists in the clear realization which Christians have gained in the course of this development that the situation means nothing more nor less than the laying bare of the individual, in which process it becomes evident that the whole organization of the world, even what is supposedly Christian, bears the characteristic stamp of human insurgency against the absolute claims of God."—*E.P.S. Geneva*

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-50